

and substantial impact on those children because this legislation threatens to take children who are not now living in poverty and put them into poverty by virtue of the withdrawal of resources that are available to those children in those families, and that we ought not allow to happen.

The report also points out that we have seen the number of people, just recently, who are living in poverty in this Nation decline, that in 1994 there were 1.2 million fewer poor people living in poverty than in 1993. We also see that the changes that this Congress and the administration made on the earned income tax credit for working families where we provide some subsidy to low wages in those families to keep people in the work force as opposed to the welfare rolls, that that has also reduced the number of families that go to work every day but simply work at wages that are insufficient to keep their family out of poverty.

So that is the good news. That is the good news of what this administration has done and changes that Congress has made.

But now the report tells us that, if we were to enact the Senate welfare bill, that we could expect as many as 1.2 million new children, who are currently not in poverty, to be placed in poverty, and God forbid if we were to enact the House-passed welfare bill, we could see as many as 2.1 or 2.3 million children who are not now in poverty being placed in poverty.

Now to understand what this means, Mr. Speaker, if you read the recommendations of this report from the administration, it becomes very clear that within these recommendations we can have historic and dramatic welfare reform that conforms with what our constituents want to see happen, what people on welfare want to see happen, and what we want to see happen, and that is that we put in place a comprehensive and concerted plan to move people from the welfare rolls to the payroll, that people are required to go to work when they have the skills and the talent to do so, and we were willing to help people gain those skills and that talent to move them off of the welfare roll.

We can do all of that and not hurt the 1 or 2 million children that we see will be hurt if the Republican-passed bills are passed, and that currently seems to be the intent of the conferees who are meeting on this matter.

If in fact we do that after receiving this report, we must understand that we are now knowingly, knowingly selecting policy options to place children in poverty that are not now in poverty. That decision reaches a moral dimension, and we ought not, those of us who are fortunate enough to be elected to positions of public policy, who have the trust of our constituents and the trust of this Nation, should not be selecting policy options that knowingly put children into poverty that are not in poverty today.

This is not a contest between the status quo because the status quo with respect to welfare is unacceptable. The President has made it clear that it is unacceptable to him, the Republicans have made it clear that it is unacceptable to them, and the Democrats have made it clear that it is unacceptable to us. This is about whether or not we design policies to put families to work, to make sure that the day care they need is in place, their children will be taken care of and they can move off of the welfare rolls, as this Nation expects those individuals to do. But all of that is threatened by the passage of either the Senate or the House bill and its infliction of terrible, terrible results on the children of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, those bills should not be passed.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION EXCELLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted, as we wind down the defense authorization conference, and I think we are going to have a bill very shortly for the country, I just wanted to talk a little bit about what we have done with that bill.

You know, our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], who is the first Republican chairman of the Committee on National Security in 40 years, put together an excellent bill this year, and he worked hand in glove with the chairman of the defense appropriation, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], to see to it that we had side-by-side packages that addressed a number of concerns of both the people who were the uniform in the armed services, and of course all Americans who are concerned about national security, and I just wanted to go over a couple of the things that we did.

One thing that we did, and very basically, was we plused up the budget. We added money for equipment in very basic areas that is important to all uniformed people. I call it readiness spending. We spent money on ammunition. In my estimation we have about half the ammo that we need if we are going to fight two regional conflicts, and that means that the Marines, or the Army, or other services who are engaged in land conflict might find themselves running out of ammo about halfway through that fight. So, one thing that we did with this budget under the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] is to put in about \$1 billion extra for ammunition, all the way from M-16 rounds to those so-called precision guided munitions that we saw on television during Desert Storm where the world's luckiest Iraqi taxicab driver just made it across the bridge before that one precision guided bomb went in and hit

that one strut on the bridge and blew it up. We added those extra dollars for ammo because that is the best service you can do for your uniformed people because that is what keeps them alive in a fight, in a conflict.

Another thing we did was increase sealift and airlift. We do not have enough ships and enough airlift to get our people to the battle in time, and because of that in the last war we had to actually go out and rent a bunch of ships. It is kind of a well-kept secret, but if our allies had not agreed with our purpose in Desert Storm, we might have been very much hurting for sealift, but the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] saw to it that we plused up sealift, plused up airlift, and we are now on our way to developing an excellent C-17 aircraft that will be able to take big cargo into very short airstrips in troubled spots around the world.

Another area that we involved ourselves in was missile defense, and I think, if there is any hallmark to this chairman's position, his tenure as chairman of the Committee on National Security, his hallmark is that he recognizes that we live in an age of missiles and that this Nation, the people of this Nation, have a right to be defended against incoming ballistic missiles, and our troops in theater should also be defended against some of those slower moving missiles like the Scuds that hit our troops in Desert Storm. So we have undertaken an aggressive program to provide what we call theater missile defenses. Those are short-range defenses against a slower moving ballistic missile so, if our troops are in Saudi Arabia, or on the Korean Peninsula, or other places around the world, and they are shot at by slow-moving ballistic missiles, we will be able to destroy those missiles before they reach our troops. The Republican leadership and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] have been the architects of that program.

We also initiated a national missile defense, and the interesting thing is most Americans think we have one already, but, as you know, Mr. Speaker, we do not. We have no defenses against incoming intercontinental ballistic missiles, but we directed this administration to develop and deploy a national missile defense, and I think it is a step we should have taken a long time ago. Under this chairman FLOYD SPENCE, our Republican chairman of the Committee on National Security, for the first time in 40 years we have taken that very important step.

So we have an excellent package, Mr. Speaker, and I wish I had time to tell you about all of the things and the provisions that we have in this particular bill, but I think we can say to the American people that they will be more secure because of the chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] of the Committee on National Security and because of the extra dollars that we are putting

in defense and that insurance policy for the American people.

□ 1830

THE TIME HAS COME FOR THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY TO RESIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-LARD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, in order to start off this period of time where we are going to address some issues that have occurred today, some current articles, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] for an opening statement.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the revelations brought forth this morning in the Wall Street Journal have caused me, along with many of my colleagues, to believe that the Secretary of Energy has crossed a line that goes far beyond the indiscretion, the mismanagement, and the incompetence which have, unfortunately, all too often been the hallmark of Secretary O'Leary's tenure. The Secretary has moved out of the gray area and leapt into an obvious and indefensible abuse of office. I am speaking of her use of taxpayer money to hire private investigators for the purpose of compiling a media enemies list. It is for this reason that we are sending a letter to the President of the United States asking him to demand Secretary O'Leary's immediate resignation.

It is clear that this specific use of taxpayer money is way beyond the pale.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, what we have found in some of the earlier period today, we got a lot of calls in my office where people thought this was more than just wasteful spending of taxpayer dollars, but to use taxpayer dollars to hire a private investigative firm to develop information or an enemies list, as was mentioned in the Wall Street Journal article, goes beyond, as the gentleman says, the gray area, and really crosses the line.

I think we have already started the process here on the floor of the House and around the Hill here of talking with different individuals. They have become very upset at what has happened today on revealing this, that the Secretary of Energy has misused these tax dollars. We have a letter that is, as was mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio, going to the President that has almost 70 signature on it now, and it has gained momentum. This is on top of other patterns that have been developing.

Over the last 6 months we have seen several articles in the paper about the travel that has been going on through the Department of Energy. Secretary O'Leary often takes many people with her when she travels. She upgrades to

first class, stays at resorts or four-star hotels, and has really been living the good life on taxpayers' money.

Mr. HOKE. If the gentleman will continue to yield on that point, I think it is an ironic footnote that in fact when the White House, finding out about this, tried to determine where the Secretary was today, it turns out that, of course, the Secretary was not in Washington. In fact, the Secretary was in Louisiana raising money for the Democratic candidate for Governor in Louisiana, and had to be asked to come back to the White House to speak, apparently, to Mr. Panetta, the President's Chief of Staff, to explain, and perhaps more than to explain her actions in this regard.

Mr. TIAHRT. Once again, the travel budget seems to be the issue here. I think, again, we are just noting that this is a pattern that has been developing of wasteful management. Even Vice President GORE, in his National Performance Review, looked at the Department of Energy and found that in the environmental management portion, that they were 40 percent inefficient, citing that over the next 70 years it could cost taxpayers up to \$30 billion if we do not do something about it.

Also we have found that the Department of Energy was 20 percent behind in their milestones, which means they are behind schedule in one out of five projects. So we have a pattern developing of poor management of the taxpayers' dollars.

Then we come to this morning's article, which says that this private investigative firm that was paid for out of taxpayer dollars was developing an enemies list, and we find out that Senator DOLE is at the top of the list. Other Members of Congress were also involved. I heard from a member of the Department of Energy that I was also on the list, at No. 13. I think that is a very unlucky number for the Secretary.

Mr. HOKE. If the gentleman will yield for a question, what do you suppose would be the reaction of your constituents if you were to spend \$100 out of your official account to investigate and rate the media as to how they report on your official proceedings?

Mr. TIAHRT. The gentleman brings up a good point. All of us wonder how we are doing in the media, but none of us that I know of take taxpayer dollars and hire a private investigation firm to go in and do that, act for us. We all read the clips ourselves and make kind of a mental tally, but we do not misuse taxpayer dollars. I think that is the important difference between what goes on in Congress and what is going on in the Department of Energy, with the Secretary of Energy.

Mr. HOKE. I think it speaks for itself. It is just incredible. As the President's own press secretary, Mike McCurie, said today, "On the face of it, it is simply unacceptable." When he was asked if she would be asked to resign, McCurie said, "I don't want to

speculate on that." I think the time has come when 68 of our colleagues agree, and counting, that the time has come for the Secretary to resign.

CLARIFYING THE RECORD WITH REGARD TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, sometimes wild rumors float in the press that just come out of the thin air. The gentleman from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, one of our dearest friends and a Navy captain, retired in the Reserve, I mean an active captain in the Reserve, is the chairman of our Committee on National Security, sometimes referred to as the Committee on Armed Services.

His five subcommittee chairmen, of which I am one, and the gentleman from California, DUNCAN HUNTER, spoke for 5 minutes earlier, we stand behind him foursquare. This is an absolute fantasy that anybody in our conference, all 233 of us, to be 234 tomorrow, and 235 after the 18th of this month, a friend just told me, the 235 of us love FLOYD SPENCE, a great leader. The military men and women across this country in every service, and across this world, think this is one outstanding chairman of our Committee on National Security. Please kill the rumor before the regular tabloid press picks it up.

MISUSE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY BY HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PUTTING TO REST RUMORS ABOUT CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, along the vein of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], I am a Congressman from South Carolina, and I am so glad to hear this put to a rest. This is a funny town where rumors can start without any basis. I think that was something that needed to be said. I congratulate the gentleman for saying it, because the gentleman from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, has been a great Member of Congress, he has been a good chairman, and serves his country well.

The reason I really want to share a few minutes with those that are listening tonight is that I live in the Third Congressional District, and the Savannah River site is the largest DOE industrial facility in the chain. I have been told that, and I believe that to be correct. We have lost about 8,900 people due to layoffs in the last few years where we are trying to downsize the